103D CONGRESS 2D SESSION

S. 2564

To delay the required implementation date for enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance programs under the Clean Air Act and to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to reissue the regulations relating to the programs, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

November 30 (legislative day, September 12), 1994

Mr. Gregg introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works

A BILL

To delay the required implementation date for enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance programs under the Clean Air Act and to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to reissue the regulations relating to the programs, and for other purposes.

- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.
- 4 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that, in carrying out
- 5 title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), the
- 6 Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency

1	(referred to in this Act as the "Administrator") has failed
2	to—
3	(1) adequately consider alternative programs to
4	centralized vehicle emission testing programs, as re-
5	quired by section $182(c)(3)(C)(vi)$ of such Act (42)
6	U.S.C. 7511a(c)(3)(C)(vi)); and
7	(2) provide adequate credit to States for the al-
8	ternative programs.
9	(b) Purpose.—The purpose of this Act is to require
10	the Administrator to—
11	(1) reassess the determinations of the Adminis-
12	trator with respect to the equivalency of centralized
13	and decentralized programs under section
14	182(c)(3)(C)(vi) of such Act (42 U.S.C.
15	7511a(c)(3)(C)(vi); and
16	(2) issue new regulations governing the pro-
17	grams that—
18	(A) result in minimum disruption to the
19	ability of States to comply with other require-
20	ments of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);
21	and
22	(B) provide States a reasonable oppor-
23	tunity to comply with the new regulations and
24	implement decentralized testing programs.

SEC. 2. IMPLEMENTATION OF ENHANCED VEHICLE INSPEC-2 TION PROGRAMS. 3 (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State shall not be required to implement 5 an enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance program under section 182(c)(3) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7511a(c)(3)) prior to March 1, 1996. 8 (b) Reassessment of Regulations.— (1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall— 9 10 (A) immediately rescind the regulations issued on November 5, 1992 (57 Fed. Reg. 11 12 52950), relating to operation of the program 13 described in subsection (a) on a centralized basis: and 14 (B) during the period beginning on the 15 date of enactment of this Act and ending on 16 March 1, 1996— 17 18 (i) reassess the determinations made 19 by the Administrator with respect to oper-20 ation of the program described in sub-21 section (a) on a centralized basis, taking 22 into consideration comments submitted by 23 States: and 24 (ii) issue new regulations relating to 25 operation of the program described in sub-

1	section (a) on a centralized basis or decen-
2	tralized basis, at the option of each State.
3	(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations issued
4	under paragraph (1)(B)(ii) shall—
5	(A) in accordance with the intent of sec-
6	tion $182(c)(3)(C)(vi)$ of the Clean Air Act (42
7	U.S.C. 7511a(c)(3)(C)(vi))—
8	(i) make reasonably available to
9	States the option of operation of the pro-
10	gram described in subsection (a) on a de-
11	centralized basis; and
12	(ii) establish criteria that a State
13	must meet in order to demonstrate that a
14	decentralized program of the State is
15	equally effective as a centralized program;
16	and
17	(B)(i) provide each State a reasonable op-
18	portunity to submit (at the option of the State)
19	a new revision to a plan under section 182(c)(3)
20	of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7511a(c)(3)) based on
21	the new regulations, which revision shall replace
22	any revision to a plan previously submitted by
23	the State under section $182(c)(3)$ of such Act;
24	and

- 1 (ii) include a schedule that provides States 2 a reasonable opportunity to implement any new 3 revisions to plans that they submit.
 - (3) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding section 706 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law, if the regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (1)(B)(ii) are reviewed by a court, the court shall hold unlawful and set aside the regulations if the regulations are found to be unsupported by a preponderance of the evidence.
- 11 (c) Prohibition on Imposition of Sanctions.—
 12 Until such time as the Administrator has carried out sub13 section (b)(1)—
 - (1) the Administrator may not issue a finding, disapproval, or determination under section 179(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7509(a)), or apply a sanction specified in section 179(b) of such Act, to a State with respect to a failure to implement a program described in subsection (a), or any portion of such a program; and
 - (2) the Administrator and the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration of the Department of Transportation may not take any adverse action, against a State with respect to a failure described in paragraph (1), under—

1	(A) section 176 of the Clean Air Act (42
2	U.S.C. 7506);
3	(B) chapter 53 of title 49, United States
4	Code;
5	(C) subpart T of part 51, or subpart A of
6	part 93, of title 40, Code of Federal Regula-
7	tions (commonly known as the "transportation
8	conformity rule"); or
9	(D) part 6, 51, or 93 of title 40, Code of
10	Federal Regulations (commonly known as the
11	"general conformity rule").
12	(d) Full Credit for Decentralized Pro-
13	GRAMS.—Until such time as the Administrator has carried
14	out subsection (b)(1), for the purpose of the attainment
15	demonstration and the reasonable further progress dem-
16	onstration required under section $182(c)(2)$ of the Clean
17	Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7511a(c)(2)), the Administrator
18	shall—
19	(1) deem that the emission reductions cal-
20	culated by States for inspection and maintenance
21	under their State implementation plans would be
22	achieved as if the planned program had been imple-
23	mented; or
24	(2) if appropriate, consider the operation of the
25	program described in subsection (a) on a decentral-

- 1 ized basis as equivalent to the operation of the pro-
- gram on a centralized basis in any case in which a
- 3 State demonstrates that a determination of such an

4 equivalency is reasonable.

0